arXiv:1610.08224v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 26 Oct 2016

Interfacial adsorption in 2D pure and random-bond Potts models

Nikolaos G. Fytas[1], Panagiotis E. Theodorakis[2], and Anastasios Malakis[1,3]
[1]*Applied Mathematics Research Centre, Coventry University, Coventry CV1 5FB, United Kingdom*
[2]*Institute of Physics, Polish Academy of Sciences, Al. Lotników 32/46, 02-668, Warsaw, Poland and*
[3]*Department of Physics, Section of Solid State Physics, University of Athens, Panepistimiopolis, GR 15784 Zografou, Greece*
(Dated: October 27, 2016)

We study using Monte Carlo simulations the finite-size scaling behavior of the interfacial adsorption of the two-dimensional square-lattice q-states Potts model. We consider the pure and random-bond versions of the Potts model for $q = 3, 4, 5, 8$ and $q = 10$, thus probing the interfacial properties at the originally continuous, weak, and strong first-order phase transitions, including the borderline $q = 4$ case. For the pure systems our results support the early scaling predictions for the size dependence of the interfacial adsorption at both first- and second-order phase transitions, whereas logarithmic corrections are found to be necessary for a proper description at $q = 4$. For the disordered systems, the interfacial adsorption at the (disordered induced) continuous transitions is discussed, applying standard scaling arguments and invoking findings for bulk critical properties. The self-averaging properties of the interfacial adsorption are also analyzed by studying the infinite limit-size extrapolation of properly defined signal-to-noise ratios.

PACS numbers: 05.50.+q, 75.10.Hk, 75.10.Nr

I. INTRODUCTION

Critical interfacial phenomena have been studied extensively over the last decades, both experimentally and theoretically [1–4]. A well-known example is wetting, where the macroscopically thick phase, e.g., the fluid, is formed between the substrate and the other phase, say, the gas. Liquid and gas are separated by the interface. An interesting complication arises when one considers the possibility of more than two phases. A third phase may be formed at the interface between the two other phases. An experimental realization is the two-component fluid system in equilibrium with its vapor phase [2, 5]. Both of the above scenarios may be mimicked in statistical physics in a simplified fashion, by either the two-state Ising model in wetting - with the state "+1" representing, say, the fluid, and "-1" the gas - or for the case of a third phase via multi-state spin models, simply by fixing distinct boundary states at the opposite sides of the system. In this latter case, the formation of the third phase with an excess of the non-boundary states has been called as interfacial adsorption [6, 7].

Throughout the years, various aspects of the interfacial adsorption have been investigated via Monte Carlo methods and density renormalization-group calculations on the basis of specific multi-state spin models, namely Potts and Blume-Capel models [6, 8–16]. Additional scaling and analytic arguments have been presented [6, 9, 12, 17–20], though not all of them have been concretely confirmed numerically, due to the restricted system sizes studied and the apparent underlying scaling corrections (in some cases also because of the uncertainties in the location of critical points). However, notable results in the field include the determination of critical exponents and scaling properties of the temperature and lattice-size dependencies, as well as the clarification of the fundamental role of the type of the bulk transition, with isotropic scaling holding at continuous and tricritical bulk transitions, and anisotropic scaling at bulk transitions of first-order type.

More recently, the role of randomness on the interfacial properties has been studied [21] and was found to affect, especially, the position of the interface, the excess or interfacial adsorption, and the form of the histograms resulting from the different random realizations. Still, predictions of the isotropic finite-size scaling description for the interfacial adsorption at continuous phase transitions were observed to hold, at least for the particular case of the dilute 8-states Potts model studied in Ref. [21]. Attention should be drawn to related previous work on interfacial phenomena in dilute ferromagnetic Potts models, in particular, considering hierarchical lattices, i.e. applying the Migdal-Kadanoff real space renormalization to the square lattice [22], or performing a preliminary Monte Carlo study for the square lattice model [23].

Motivated by Ref. [21], in the present work we examine the effects of bond randomness on the scaling behavior of the interfacial adsorption of two-dimensional Potts models for various values of the internal states within the regime $q = 3 - 10$. In parallel, we present complementary results for the corresponding pure models, covering the complete spectrum of continuous, weak, and strong first-order phase transitions, including the tricky $q = 4$ case [24]. For the pure systems our results support the early scaling predictions for the size dependence of the interfacial adsorption. For the random systems, the interfacial adsorption at the disordered-induced continuous transitions also follows the standard isotropic scaling with exponents that can be traced back to the best-known estimates of the bulk critical exponent ratio

β/ν, thus extending and reinforcing the main result of Ref. [21] that was restricted on the case $q = 8$. On the other hand, logarithmic corrections are found to be necessary for a proper scaling description of the interfacial adsorption at $q = 4$ for both pure and random versions of the system. Finally, the self-averaging properties of the interfacial adsorption are discussed in terms of properly defined signal-to-noise ratios.

The outline of the article is as follows: In Sec. II the model and the interfacial adsorption are introduced and in Sec. III the numerical method implemented is outlined. Our main finite-size scaling analysis and results are presented in Sec. IV. The summary, Sec. V, concludes the article.

II. MODEL AND INTERFACIAL ADSORPTION

We study the nearest-neighbor q-states Potts model on the square lattice described by the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H} = -\sum_{\langle ij \rangle} J_{ij} \delta_{\sigma_i,\sigma_j}. \qquad (1)$$

The Potts variable at site i, σ_i, takes the values $1, 2, \ldots, q$ [24] and the ferromagnetic random couplings $J_{ij} > 0$ between nearest-neighbor sites i and j are either J_1, with probability p, or J_2, with probability $1 - p$. In the case $J_1 > J_2$, one has either strong or weak bonds. Then, the ratio $r = J_2/J_1$ defines the disorder strength. Clearly, the value $r = 1$ corresponds to the pure model.

In this article, we shall consider the system at its self-dual point, where both couplings occur with the same probability, $p = 1/2$. Then, the phase-transition temperatures, $k_{\rm B}T_{\rm c}/J_1$, between the ordered ferromagnetic phase and the high-temperature disordered phase are known exactly from self-duality for arbitrary values of the internal states q and disorder-strength ratios r [25]

$$\left(e^{(J_1/k_{\rm B}T_{\rm c})} - 1\right)\left(e^{(rJ_1/k_{\rm B}T_{\rm c})} - 1\right) = q. \qquad (2)$$

Accordingly, analysis on the critical behavior of the interfacial adsorption, based on Monte Carlo simulation data, as it is also done in the present paper, are significantly simplified.

Bulk criticality of such random Potts models on the square lattice has attracted much interest, partly, because the transition is of continuous type for all values of q, while being, in the pure case, of first order for $q > 4$ [24, 26]. Exact values of the critical exponents are only known in the clean case [24]. Numerical analysis, in the dilute case suggest that the bulk critical exponents depend rather mildly on q [26]. Then, the analysis of the interfacial adsorption in these models may be simplified by the fact, that isotropic finite-size scaling is expected to hold at continuous transitions [6, 9, 10]. Static and dynamic bulk critical properties of the random Potts models have been estimated, using a variety of, predominantly, numerical methods [26].



FIG. 1: (color online) Typical equilibrium Monte Carlo configurations of an $L = 100$, $q = 10$, pure (upper panel) and random-bond $r = 1/10$ (lower panel) Potts model at $T = 0.98T_c$. In both cases, red color depicts the $q = 1$ states, blue color the $q = 2$ states, whereas the non-boundary states ($q \geq 3$) adsorbed at the interface are shown blackened. Note that the fixed boundaries [1 : 2] are also included in these illustrations.

The degeneracy between the q equivalent Potts states may be lifted by appropriate boundary conditions. In order to study the interfacial adsorption, denoted hereafter as W, we shall employ special boundary conditions, distinguishing the cases [1 : 1] and [1 : 2]. For the case [1 : 1], the Potts variable is set, at all boundary sites, equal to $q = 1$, while for the case [1 : 2], the variable is set equal to 1 at one half of the boundary sites, and to 2 at the opposite half of the boundary sites. Then, the boundary condition [1 : 2] introduces an interface between the 1-rich domain (or phase) and the 2-rich domain (or phase). By examining typical Monte Carlo equilibrium configurations, as shown in Fig. 1 for an instance of the pure (upper panel) and random (lower panel) $q = 10$

Potts model, it is seen that at the interface between the 1- and and 2-rich domains an excess of the non-boundary states is generated compared to the case of the absence of an interface. As expected, in the dilute case, the position of the interface, as well as the extent of the intervening third phase of non-boundary states, may be strongly affected by the spatial distribution of the couplings.

Then, the interfacial adsorption, measuring the surplus of non-boundary states induced by the interface between the 1- and 2-rich regions is defined for lattices with L^2 non-boundary sites, with L being the linear dimension of the lattice, by [6, 21]

$$W = \frac{1}{L} \sum_n \sum_i \left[(\delta_{\sigma_i,n})_{[1:2]} - (\delta_{\sigma_i,n})_{[1:1]} \right], \qquad (3)$$

summing over all non-boundary sites i and all non-boundary states $n = 3, 4, \ldots, q$. The thermal average is of course taken. Obviously, W may be geometrically interpreted as the effective width of the domain of non-boundary states between the 1- and 2-rich domains.

III. SIMULATION DETAILS

In our simulations of the Potts models we applied the Metropolis and the cluster-flip Wolff algorithm [27]. Of course, cluster flips violating the boundary conditions are not allowed [28]. As usual, small lattices may be simulated using the Metropolis algorithm, while the Wolff algorithm is more efficient and is preferred for larger, say $L > 30$, system sizes. Overall, we studied lattices with up to 100×100 sites for both pure and random Potts models. Only for the pure $q = 3$ Potts model data for system sizes up to 200^2 sites have been generated and taken from Ref. [21].

Certainly, equilibration and averaging times depend on the lattice size. Moreover, for random models, we observed that the given bond realization may affect these times. In the case of the Metropolis algorithm, eventually, simulations with 10^7 Monte Carlo steps per site for $L = 10$ were performed, increasing the length of the runs, roughly, with L^2. On the other hand, for the application of the Wolff algorithm, the number of clusters used in our simulations varied from 2×10^7 for the smaller systems sizes up to 3×10^9 for the larger sizes considered.

In random systems, the main source of errors stems from the fact that the simulation data may vary drastically among different random configurations. In this work, the corresponding histograms or distributions have been recorded for $r = 1/10$ and all values of q considered. Noteworthy, bulk properties of the random-bond Potts model for various values of r and q have been studied quite extensively before [26, 29–35] and the obtained pool of results will prove to be extremely useful for the analysis in the following Section. The histograms at the critical point show nearly Gaussian shapes, but being weakly tailed, in accordance with previous observations and discussions in our previous work [21] and in Ref. [22] for the dilute Potts models on hierarchical lattices. The standard errors resulting from an ensemble average over bond realizations decrease with the number of configurations, $\mathcal{N}$, as $\sim 1/\sqrt{\mathcal{N}}$. The proportionality factor seems to become somewhat smaller for larger lattices. To obtain reasonable accuracy, we averaged over a large number of different bond configurations, varying from $\mathcal{N} = 20 \times 10^3$ for the smaller system sizes studied down to 10^3 for the larger ones. For pure Potts models ($r = 1$) error bars follow from averaging over a few hundreds of Monte Carlo runs employing different random numbers, as usual. Finally, for the application of finite-size scaling on the numerical data in terms of characteristic power-law fittings as will be discussed below, we employed the standard criterion of the χ^2/DOF, where DOF denotes the number of degrees of freedom.

IV. FINITE-SIZE SCALING ANALYSIS

To determine critical properties from Monte Carlo data we use finite-size scaling arguments. For the interfacial adsorption, W, one expects [6]

$$W \approx L^a \Omega(tL^{1/\nu}), \qquad (4)$$

where the critical exponent a is determined by the bulk critical exponents β and ν of the order parameter and correlation length, respectively, via [6]

$$a = 1 - \frac{\beta}{\nu}, \qquad (5)$$

$t = |T - T_c|/T_c$ is the reduced critical temperature and Ω the scaling function. A more refined ansatz invokes corrections to the asymptotic scaling behavior, as will be discussed below. Note however that in the present work, we are not interested in the temperature dependence of W, but rather only on its size dependence. From the above scaling assumption (4) we derive that the leading critical behavior of the interfacial adsorption is given by $W \sim L^a$ [6].

At the critical (and tricritical) points, the singularities in the interfacial adsorption are induced by bulk critical fluctuations. On the other hand, at first-order transitions there are no bulk critical fluctuations and the divergence of W arises from an interface delocalisation transition [36]. In the latter case, for lattices of square shapes, a linear divergence of the form $W \sim L$ is expected for the interfacial adsorption at the transition point according to the arguments of Selke *et al.* [9].

The above scaling predictions have been confirmed reasonably well in previous Monte Carlo simulations for pure $q = 3$ Potts and Blume-Capel models showing continuous transitions [6, 8–10]. On the other hand for the case of first-order transitions where metastability effects cast further difficulties in the scaling analysis, the expected linear divergence has been only partially supported by the numerical data at hand [9, 11]. In the



FIG. 2: (color online) Finite-size scaling of the interfacial adsorption of the pure and random-bond $q = 3$ Potts model. The inset illustrates the infinite limit-size extrapolation of the effective exponent $a_{\rm r}^{\rm (eff)}$.



FIG. 3: (color online) Finite-size scaling of the interfacial adsorption of the pure and random-bond $q = 4$ Potts model.

present study, we extend and refine previous results on the size-dependence of the interfacial adsorption by considering the pure Potts model for various values of the internal states q as well as by including bond randomness in the system.

We start our presentation of results by contrasting the critical interfacial adsorption of the pure and random 3-states Potts model in Fig. 2. The data for the pure model (black circles) were taken from Ref. [21] and have been analyzed according to that paper by fitting them (black line in Fig. 2) to equation

$$W \sim L^a(1 + bL^{-x}), \tag{6}$$

taking into account the leading corrections-to-scaling exponent x. The resulting estimate for the critical exponent $a_{\rm p} = 0.867(2)$ agrees nicely within errors with the predicted exact value $a = 13/15 = 0.866\cdots$ (we remind the reader that $(\beta/\nu)_{\rm p} = 2/15 = 0.133\cdots$) [24]. Note that we fixed the leading correction-to-scaling exponents x to the predicted exact value $x = 3/5$ [37–39] and that the underscore symbols p(r) refer to the pure(random) cases, respectively. Accordingly, the findings on the pure 3-states Potts model strongly support the correctness of the finite-size scaling description (4).

The main focus of the current study is of course on the dilute Potts model. Following previous considerations on its bulk critical properties, we set $r = 1/10$, where the randomness dominated behavior is expected to show up already for moderate lattice sizes. The arguments leading to this observation were originally discussed by by Wang *et al.* [40] for the dilute Ising model and later used for other Potts model as well [26, 29–35]. In particular, we monitored, in our simulations, the size dependence of the critical interfacial adsorption. Numerical results for the $q = 3$ random model are depicted by the red circles in Fig. 2. Fitting the Monte Carlo data to Eq. (6) with a correction-to-scaling exponent set to the value $x = -1$ which optimizes the fit, one obtains effective exponents by varying the lower system size $L_{\rm min}$ included in the fitting. A second-order polynomial extrapolation of these effective exponents, as illustrated in the corresponding inset, provides us with the value $a_{\rm r} = 0.868(11)$. This estimate of $a_{\rm r}$ is compatible to the value 0.8679(3), if one accepts Eq. (5) and the estimate $(\beta/\nu)_{\rm r} = 0.1321(3)$ for the bulk critical exponent ratio of the dilute $q = 3$ Potts model given in Ref. [33]. Thus, we may conclude that for the random $q = 3$ case as well $a_{\rm r} = 1 - (\beta/\nu)_{\rm r}$, in accordance with the finite-size scaling ansatz (4), although it is true that for this particular case there seems to be hardly any difference among the exact value of the exponent ratio β/ν of the pure model and the corresponding estimates for the random model. This fact has also been underlined in an extensive study of the magnetization of the $q = 3$ random-bond Potts model by Picco [31].

Next, we consider the more complicated $q = 4$ model. As it is well-known, this is a borderline case of the Potts universality class, for which multiplicative logarithmic scaling corrections have been reported and verified numerically for standard thermodynamic quantities [41]. We also find it here necessary to include these logarithmic corrections for a proper scaling description of the numerical data. In Fig. 3 we illustrate the finite-size scaling behavior of the critical interfacial adsorption for both the pure (black circles) and random (red circles) $q = 4$ models. The solid lines are fittings of the form

$$W \sim L^a \left(1 + b\frac{1}{\ln(L)} + b'\frac{\ln[\ln(L)]}{\ln(L)}\right), \tag{7}$$

giving the results $a_{\rm p} = 0.875(9)$ and $a_{\rm r} = 0.863(8)$, for the pure and random model, respectively, as also indicated in the panel. Again, isotropic scaling and Eq. (5) is satisfied, to a high accuracy for the pure model, for which $(\beta/\nu)_{\rm p} = 1/8 = 0.125$, and within errors for the random model for which $(\beta/\nu)_{\rm r} = 0.1385(3)$ [33].



FIG. 4: (color online) Finite-size scaling of the interfacial adsorption of the pure and random-bond Potts model for various values of the internal states q in the originally first-order regime, as indicated.



FIG. 5: (color online) $R_{\rm W}$ as a function of the inverse linear system size for two values of q, as indicated. The solid lines are second-order polynomial extrapolations to the limit $L \to \infty$.

The second part of our study refers to the interfacial properties at the originally first-order transition regime of the Potts model, i.e., for $q > 4$. We have simulated the model with internal states $q = 5$, 8, and $q = 10$ in both its pure and random ($r = 1/10$) version. The data for the random $q = 8$ case have been taken from Ref. [21]. Our numerical results for the critical interfacial adsorption and the relevant scaling analysis are illustrated in Fig. 4. Several comments are in order: (i) For the pure system we find a clear linear divergence of W for all values of $q > 4$ as predicted by scaling arguments [9], since fittings of the form $W \sim L^{a_{\rm p}}$ give estimates of $a_{\rm p} \approx 1$ without the need of including scaling corrections. (ii) For the corresponding random system fittings of the form (6) with a fixed correction of $x = -1$ give estimates of $a_{\rm r}$ that again support the isotropic scaling and Eq. (5). Note the most accurate existing estimates of the ratio $(\beta/\nu)_{\rm r}$ are 0.141(3), 0.145(5), and 0.155(5) for $q = 5$, 8, and $q = 10$, respectively [30–35]. (iii) Using a wide range of internal states within the regime $q = 3 - 10$ and two versions of the Potts model, namely the pure model and its random counterpart, we have shown that isotropic scaling holds, as well as the relation $a = 1 - \beta/\nu$.

For all systems studied we also recorded, in addition to the interfacial properties, standard thermodynamic quantities, for both types of boundary conditions. In particular, we measured the specific heat $C_{1:1}$ and $C_{1:2}$ and the order parameter given by the majority fraction of the Potts states [24], $m_{1:1}$ and $m_{1:2}$. Fittings of $m_{1:1}$ and $m_{1:2}$, vanishing at $T_{\rm c}$ as $\sim L^{-\beta/\nu}$, gave estimates of the magnetic exponent ratio compatible to the above presented results, thus giving further credit to the current numerical data. It is also interesting to note that although the specific-heat data for the pure $q > 4$ systems could not be fully described by the standard L^2 scaling behavior for systems with linear sizes up to $L = 100$ (possibly due to strong corrections, especially for the case of the $q = 5$ weak first-order transition), we have been able to probe nicely the first-order character of the transition based on the linear divergence of the interfacial adsorption shown for system sizes $L \leq 100$.

As a large part of the current contribution is based on the random version of the Potts model, we close this Section with an illustration of the self-averaging properties of the interfacial adsorption. As we know, our numerical studies of disordered systems are carried out using finite samples; each sample is a particular random realization of the quenched disorder. A measurement of a thermodynamic property, say W for the interfacial adsorption considered here, yields a different value for every sample. In an ensemble of disordered samples of linear size L the values of W are distributed according to a probability distribution. The behavior of this distribution is directly related to the issue of self-averaging. In particular, by studying the behavior of the width of this distribution, one may address qualitatively the issue of self-averaging, as has already been stressed by previous authors. In general, we characterize the distribution by its disorder average $[W]$, and also by the relative variance $R_W = V_W/[W]^2$, where $V_W = [W^2] - [W]^2$. The limiting value of this ratio is indicative of the self-averaging properties of the system [42, 43]. In Fig. 5 we show the infinite limit-size extrapolation of the ratio R_W for the random-bond (again $r = 1/10$) Potts model and two selected values of q as indicated in the figure, namely the values $q = 3$ and $q = 10$. For both cases we find that $R_W \to 0$ as $L \to \infty$, indicating that the interfacial adsorption restores self-averaging in the thermodynamic limit. Similar fitting attempts for other values of q, not shown here for brevity, support our conclusion based on these data.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We performed extensive Monte Carlo simulations to study critical interfacial properties in pure and random ferromagnetic q-states Potts models on the square lattice for various values of the internal states $q \in \{3-10\}$. Interfaces have been introduced as usual by fixing the Potts variables at opposite sites in two different states. The local Metropolis and cluster-flip Wolff algorithms have been used to simulate all systems at their critical points, taking advantage of the existing self-duality. For the random models an extensive disorder averaging has been performed in order to control the sample-to-sample fluctuations of the model. Our main result is that the prediction of the isotropic finite-size scaling description for the interfacial adsorption at continuous phase transitions holds at both pure and random systems. For the pure $q > 4$ systems we have been able to probe the linear divergence of the interfacial adsorption whereas for the borderline $q = 4$ case, in both pure and disorder version, the inclusion of multiplicative logarithmic corrections was found to be necessary for a proper scaling description of the numerical data. Finally, the self-averaging properties of the interfacial adsorption were presented via the infinite limit-size extrapolation of properly defined signal-to-noise ratios.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Prof. W. Selke for suggesting this topic of research, his ongoing collaboration, as well as for many useful discussions and critical comments. N.G. Fytas is grateful to Coventry University for providing a Research Sabbatical Fellowship during which this work has been completed.

[1] For a review, see D.B. Abraham, in *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena*, ed. by C. Domb and J.L. Lebowitz (Academic Press, New York, 1986), Vol. 10.
[2] For a review, see S. Dietrich, in *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena*, ed. by C. Domb and J.L. Lebowitz (Academic Press, New York, 1988), Vol. 12.
[3] D. Bonn, J. Eggers, J. Indekeu, J. Meunier, and E. Rolley, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 739 (2009).
[4] J. Ralston, M. Popescu, and R. Sedev, Annu. Rev. Mater. Res. **38**, 23 (2008).
[5] M.R. Moldover and J.W. Cahn, Science **207**, 1073 (1980).
[6] W. Selke and W. Pesch, Z. Physik B **47**, 335 (1982); W. Selke and D.A. Huse, *ibid.* **50**, 113 (1983).
[7] M.E. Fisher, J. Stat. Phys. **34**, 667 (1984).
[8] W. Selke and J.M. Yeomans, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **16**, 2789 (1983).
[9] W. Selke, D.A. Huse, and D.M. Kroll, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **17**, 3019 (1984).
[10] A. Yamagata, Z. Phys. B **84**, 419 (1991).
[11] A. Yamagata and K. Kasono, Z. Phys. B **87**, 219 (1992).
[12] E. Carlon, F. Igloi, W. Selke, and F. Szalma, J. Stat. Phys. **96**, 531 (1999).
[13] E.V. Albano and K. Binder, Phys. Rev. E **85**, 061601 (2012).
[14] N.G. Fytas and W. Selke, Eur. Phys. J. B **86**, 365 (2013).
[15] M.L. Trobo and E.V. Albano, Eur. Phys. J. B **87**, 303 (2014).
[16] E.V. Albano and K. Binder, J. Stat. Phys. **157**, 436 (2014).
[17] J. Bricmont and J.L. Lebowitz, J. Stat. Phys. **46**, 1015 (1987).
[18] A. Messager, S. Miracle-Sole, J. Ruiz, and S. Shlosman, Commun. Math. Phys. **140**, 275 (1991).
[19] J. Cardy, Nucl. Phys. B **565**, 506 (2000).
[20] G. Delfino and A. Squarcini, Annals of Physics **342**, 171 (2014).
[21] N.G. Fytas, A. Malakis, W. Selke, and L.N. Shchur, Eur. Phys. J B **88**, 204 (2015).
[22] C. Monthus and T. Garel, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 134416 (2008).
[23] A. Brener, Diploma Thesis, RWTH Aachen University, (2010).
[24] F.Y. Wu, Rev. Mod. Phys. **54**, 235 (1982).
[25] W. Kinzel and E. Domany, Phys. Rev. B **23**, 3421 (1981).
[26] For a review, see B. Berche and C. Chatelain, in *Order, Disorder, and Criticality: Advanced Problems of Phase Transition Theory*, Vol. 1, ed. by Y. Holovatch (World Scientific, Singapore, 2004), pp.147-199.
[27] D.P. Landau and K. Binder, *A Guide to Monte Carlo Simulations in Statistical Physics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005).
[28] A. Gamsa and J. Cardy, J. Stat. Mech. (2007) P08020.
[29] S. Chen, A.M. Ferrenberg, and D.P. Landau, Phys. Rev. E **52**, 1377 (1994).
[30] J. Cardy and J.L. Jacobsen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 4063 (1997).
[31] M. Picco, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 14 930 (1996).
[32] C. Chatelain and B. Berche, Phys. Rev. Lett **80**, 1670 (1997).
[33] C. Chatelain and B. Berche, Phys. Rev. E **60**, 3853 (1999).
[34] G. Palagyi, C. Chatelain, B. Berche, and F. Igloi, Eur. Phys. J. B **13**, 357 (1999).
[35] J.L. Jacobsen and M. Picco, Phys. Rev. E **61**, R13 (2000).
[36] R. Lipowsky, D.M. Kroll, and R.K.P. Zia, Phys. Rev. B **27** 4499 (1983).
[37] Vl.S. Dotsenko and V.A. Fateev, Nucl. Phys. B **240**, 312 (1984).
[38] For a review, see V. Privman, P.C. Hohenberg, A. Aharony, in *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena*, ed. by C. Domb and J.L. Lebowitz (Academic Press, New York, 1991), Vol. 14, p.1.
[39] L.N. Shchur, B. Berche, and P. Butera, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 144410 (2008).
[40] J.-S. Wang, V.B. Andreichenko, V.S. Dotsenko, and W. Selke, Physica A **164**, 221 (1990).
[41] J. Salas and A.D. Sokal, J. Stat. Phys. **88**, 567 (1997).
[42] S. Wiseman and E. Domany, Phys. Rev. E **52**, 3469 (1995); Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 22 (1998).

[43] A. Aharony and A.B. Harris, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 3700 (1996).